Group II. Claims 17-23, drawn to composition comprising a macrolide antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound classified in class 514, subclass 450.

Group III. Claims 24-29, drawn to composition comprising a cephalosporin, and an endectocidic compound classified in class 514, subclass 200.

Group IV. Claims 30-35, drawn to composition comprising a fluoroquinolone antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound classified in class 514, subclass 253.08.

Group V. Claim 36, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the compound of formula I, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 613.

Group VI. Claim 37, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising a macrolide antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 450.

Group VII. Claim 38, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising cephalosporin, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 200.

Group VIII. Claim 39, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising a fluoroquinolone antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 253.08.

The Examiner has indicated that the above-identified patent application contains eight distinct inventions. However, though the eight inventions are distinct, two criteria remain that must be met in addition to patent distinctness for a proper restriction requirement:

(A) The inventions must be independent; and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required.

(*See*, Section 803 of the MPEP).

In the present case, the second criterion has not been met. Indeed, the same class and subclass of art would need to be searched for Group V, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the compound of formula I, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 613 as for elected Group I, drawn to a composition comprising the compound of formula I, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 613. Therefore, the co-examination of Groups I and V would not create a serious burden on the Examiner.

Moreover, the further inclusion of Group II, drawn to a composition comprising a macrolide antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 450; Group III, drawn to a composition comprising a cephalosporin, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 200; Group IV, drawn to a composition comprising a fluoroquinolone antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 253.08; Group VI, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising a macrolide antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 450; Group VII, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising cephalosporin, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 200; and Group VIII, drawn to a method of treating bovine respiratory disease and parasitic infection comprising the administration of a composition comprising a fluoroquinolone antibiotic, and an endectocidic compound, classified in class 514, subclass 253.08, would also not create a serious burden on the Examiner.

In fact, the inclusion of all of the claims in the above-identified application, albeit creating an additional burden on the Examiner, still would not create a serious burden. Indeed, though the present application includes claims to independent and/or distinct inventions, the Examiner must examine the entire application on the merits since the search and examination of the entire application can be made without placing a serious burden on the Examiner (*see*, Section 803 of the MPEP).

Notwithstanding the above, the Examiner should minimally examine the claim(s) of Group V in conjunction with the elected claims of Group I.

However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention cited as Group I for prosecution on the merits, and elect the following species

composition: florfenicol and ivermectin, again with traverse. This composition is claimed in at least Claims 1-9.

The Applicants believe that the next step in the prosecution of this Application should be in the form of a Notice of Allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

No fees are believed to arise due to this filing, however, if any fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0365. If the Examiner should have any questions regarding this Amendment and/or patent Application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Schering-Plough Corporation
2000 Galloping Hill Road
Patent Department, K-6-1,1990
Kenilworth, NJ 07033
Tel: (908) 298-6791
Fax: (908) 298-5388

Kiera A. Mathey
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,156